



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,023	03/11/2004	Hui Lei	00280770AA	4635
30743	7590	10/30/2006	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			TARAE, CATHERINE MICHELLE	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3623

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/797,023	LEI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. Michelle Tarae	3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to the communication received on August 17, 2006. Claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-12 are now pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 3 and 7 are acknowledged.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with regard to Parasnig et al. (U.S. 6,334,146) are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection provided below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Armstrong et al. (U.S. 6,807,423).

As per claim 1, Armstrong et al. discloses a system for pervasive enablement of business processes, comprising:

a workflow engine that executes a business process model (col. 4, lines 7-10; col. 6, lines 20-24 and 56-57; col. 8, line 67; col. 10, lines 29-31; item 15 in Figures 3-6; Business process rules are implemented to establish activity specifications (i.e., when to contact, how to contact, etc.) for users of the system.);

a context service that allows context-aware applications to obtain user context information (col. 3, lines 47-52; col. 5, lines 1-9; col. 13, lines 57-61; Context information (i.e., status, location, etc.) is obtained for users of the system.);

an interaction controller that acts as a proxy for one or more human participants in a workflow and receives specification of individual staff activities from the workflow engine, and upon receiving a staff activity specification, obtains context information of a partner instance from the context service to determine an appropriate collaboration modality for the partner instance, and forwards the engine responses from human partners back to the workflow engine, thereby handling individual interactions with human participants (col. 3, lines 52-65; col. 6, lines 48-58; col. 10, lines 29-31; When the system receives a request from one user to contact another user, the system acts on behalf of the user being contacted and based on the context information, determines the protocol for contacting the user.); and

one or more modality adapters that encapsulate details of communicating with a specific collaboration modality to receive a task from the interaction controller and deliver the task to said partner instance in a modality-specific format (col. 4, lines 35-41;

col. 6, lines 54-58; Different modes of communication are enabled via the system, where users can determine what type of modes are to be used to contact them and when.).

As per claim 2, Armstrong et al. et al. discloses the system in Claim 1, wherein the context service provides dynamic context information about human participants (col. 3, lines 47-52; col. 5, lines 1-9; col. 13, lines 57-61; Dynamic context information such as location and connectivity status are maintained for users of the system.).

As per claim 3, Armstrong et al. et al. discloses the system in Claim 2, wherein said dynamic context information includes a human participant's location, activity, connectivity and preferences (col. 3, lines 47-52; col. 5, lines 1-9; col. 11, lines 53-62; col. 13, lines 57-61).

As per claim 4, Armstrong et al. et al. discloses the system of Claim 2, wherein the context service supports both synchronous query and asynchronous callback context functions (col. 12, lines 53-67; Both synchronous (i.e., instant messaging, chat session) and asynchronous communications (i.e., email, voicemail) are supported by the system.).

As per claim 5, Armstrong et al. et al. discloses the system of Claim 1, further comprising an address book that maps individual IDs to modality-specific addresses, the interaction controller accessing the address book to look up a modality-specific address (col. 3, line 55; col. 6, lines 7-13 and 53-58; col. 9, lines 64-67; Each user of the system has unique connection addresses.).

As per claim 6, Armstrong et al. et al. discloses the system of Claim 1, wherein the modality adapters include the adapters for instant messaging, email, e-meeting, discussion threads, phones, pagers, and other communication devices (col. 4, lines 36-41; col. 6, lines 51-58; col. 12, lines 55-56).

Claims 7-12 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1-6 above. Therefore, claims 7-12 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-6 above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Jiang et al. (U.S. 7,092,370) discusses a system and method for wireless voice/data channel integration.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Tarae whose telephone number is 571-272-6727. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 571-272-6729.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



C. Michelle Tarae
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623

October 27, 2006